

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-14 are all the claims presently pending.

As an initial matter, we note that in response to the Appeal Brief filed May 29, 2007, the Patent Office has withdrawn the previous grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and has reopened prosecution. The Examiner now rejects all claims based on newly-cited prior art grounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hogan et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0111180; hereinafter “Hogan”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for controlling access rights in a cellular mobile radio system, comprising transferring roaming agreement information from a core network to a radio access network of said cellular mobile radio system, wherein said roaming agreement information is transferred independently of messages linked to calls or user equipments.

Applicant submits that Hogan fails to teach or suggest the claimed features “transferring roaming agreement information from a core network to a radio access network.” In particular, Applicant notes that Hogan recalls that the core network and the radio access network communicate via the Iu interface in the control plane.¹ The Iu interface is specified in the Technical Specification (TS) 25.413 issued by 3GPP.² Technical Specification 25.413 specifies a number of features in the control plane. However, at the time of filing of the present application (i.e., up to version V4.4.0), TS 25.413 does not disclose or suggest the claimed features “transferring roaming agreement information from a core network to a radio access network.” Further, TS 25.413 also fails to disclose or suggest “said roaming agreement is transferred independently of messages linked to calls or user equipments,” as claimed. Thus, Applicant submits that Hogan fails to teach or suggest these required features of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record for at least these reasons. Similarly, independent claims 11, 13 and 16 are patentable for analogous reasons. Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-10, 12, 14 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

¹ See Hogan, paragraphs [12] and [13].

² Applicant submits herewith an Information Disclosure Statement and a Statement Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(e) for the submission of TS 25.413, V.4.4.0.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/509,852

Attorney Docket No.: Q83107

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Davis
Registration No. 60,552

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 4, 2008